

REMARKS


In the Office Action, claims 2-8 and 10-19 are rejected for alleged § 112, first paragraph and second paragraph reasons. See, Office Action, pages 2 and 3. In response, independent claims 2 and 10 have been amended as previously provided, and thus, Applicants believe that these rejections should be withdrawn.

The claims have also been rejected for alleged anticipation and obviousness reasons as detailed on pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action. In response, independent claims 2 and 10 have been amended to further recite wherein an average diameter of the projection ranges from about 3 μm to about 10 μm . Claims 5 and 13 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. At least in view of same, Applicants believe that the pending claims as amended are distinguished from the cited art even if properly combinable. Therefore, Applicants believe that the anticipation and obviousness rejections should be withdrawn.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application should be in condition for allowance and earnestly solicit reconsideration of same.

Respectfully submitted,

BY


Thomas C. Basso (46,541)
Cust. No. 29175

Dated: November 20, 2007